

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by *Lundh* (US 6,373,834). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections because *Lundh* fails to teach at least one or more of the claimed features. For case of illustration, claim 1 is discussed first.

Claim 1, in part, calls for receiving, using a wireless controller, data transmitted from one or more wireless transmitters adapted to communicate with a plurality of mobile terminals. The Examiner argues that the base stations 22 in *Lundh* correspond to the “wireless transmitters” of claim 1. Claim 1 further specifies receiving descriptive information associated with at least a portion of the received data from the one or more wireless transmitters. The Examiner argues that this feature is taught by *Lundh* at col. 7, lines 31-44. See Office Action, p 2. The cited paragraph, however, describes frames of user data being transmitted in the downlink direction (from RNC 30 to base station 22). In contrast, the claim calls for receiving description information associated from the one or more wireless transmitters (which the Examiner earlier argues are the base stations 22 in *Lundh*). Additionally, while the cited passage describes frames of user data, it is completely silent on receiving “descriptive information” associated with the received data, as called for by the claims.

Claim 1 further calls for providing the received data and the associated descriptive information to a port interface associated with the wireless controller. The “received data” referenced in this claim element receives its antecedent basis from the first claim element. In the first claim element, this data is received by the wireless controller that is transmitted from the

one or more wireless transmitters. Thus, when read in context, the last claim element calls for providing the data that is transmitted by the wireless transmitters (“base stations” according to the Examiner) and received by the wireless controller to a port interface. Additionally, the claim element further calls for providing the descriptive information to the port interface. The Examiner argues that *Lundh* teaches this feature at col. 8, lines 14-30. While the cited passage describes a switch port interface module 120, it does not describe that the data that is provided to this interface was received from the wireless transmitters (or “base stations, according to the Examiner). Additionally, this passage also does not describe providing the descriptive information (that is associated with the received data) to the port.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable. Moreover, for at least one or more of the reasons, independent claims 7, 14, and 21 (and including any claims depending therefrom) are allowable.

The Office Action suffers other shortcomings as well. For example, claim 2 calls for encapsulating the descriptive information with the data in a packet and providing the encapsulated packet to the port interface. The Examiner argues that this feature is taught by *Lundh* at col. 9, lines 42-53. However, this cited passage describes slave timing units, and is wholly silent regarding the encapsulation of any descriptive information with the data in a packet for delivery to the port interface. For at least this reason, claim 2 is allowable.

Other claims are allowable over *Lundh* as well. Consider, for example, claim 4, which calls for receiving the descriptive information comprises receiving the descriptive information encapsulated with the data in a packet, wherein the descriptive information comprises at least one high resolution timestamp associated with the data and channel information associated with

the transmission of the data, wherein the channel information includes at least one of signal quality and relative signal strength index. The Examiner argues that this feature is taught at col. 1, lines 53-64 of *Lundh*. This cited passage does not describe encapsulating any descriptive information and it does not describe where that information is either high resolution timestamp or channel information relating to signal quality or strength index. While the cited passage does describe “best quality reception,” it does not do so in the context of encapsulating such information in a packet. To the contrary, it simply describes that a best quality signal is desired between a communicating mobile phone and a base station, and that the radio network controller of a base station selects such this best quality based on “comparably number frames received from the mobile station.” For at least this reason, claim 4 is allowable. The other claims are allowable in view of the features recited therein.

Arguments with respect to other dependent claims have been noted. However, in view of the aforementioned arguments, these arguments are moot and therefore not specifically addressed. To the extent that characterizations of the prior art references or Applicants’ claimed subject matter are not specifically addressed, it is to be understood that Applicants do not acquiesce to such characterization.

For the aforementioned reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all claims pending in the present application are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (713) 934-4064 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 15, 2006

/Ruben S. Bains/

Ruben S. Bains
Reg. No. 46,532
Williams Morgan & Amerson, P.C.
10333 Richmond Avenue, Suite 1100
Houston, TX 77042
(713) 934-4064
(713) 934-7011 (Fax)

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS